

**THE INFILTRATION OF BRITISH CHARITIES BY AN EXTINCTION REBELLION STYLE
EXTREMIST CLIMATE DOOMSDAY CULT SUBVERTING THE BRITISH DEMOCRATIC
PROCESS TO IMPLEMENT THE CLIMATE AND NATURE (CAN) BILL IN 2025
-YOU, THE PEOPLE, HAVE SPOKEN – YOU JUST DON'T KNOW IT-
10th November 2024**

The discourse below attempts to shed light on and disentangle how what was regarded in 2018/19 as an extremist and fringe environmental mindset as embodied by, for example, Extinction Rebellion (XR), Just Stop Oil or Insulate Britain and thus rejected by the British public, has infiltrated many British charities up to the highest Director General and Chief Executive level. This has led to charities such as the National Trust and the RSPB who have 5.38 and 1.2 million members respectively to have adopted such - by the public regarded as - extremist eco views and policies so that charities no longer seem to adhere to their original mission statements but have become powerful political bodies and activist groups that push for an extremist change of Britain under the guise of 'saving the planet' and achieving net zero by 2030.

Through misusing or bypassing legitimate democratic processes, such charities falsely claim to have the mandate of their unsuspecting large membership bases through eg People's Plan for Nature (PPFN) and play an active and instrumental part in pushing for the final sanctioning of extremist environmental legislation such as the Climate & Nature Bill (CAN) that will require the immediate implementation of policies leading to the inevitable destruction of the fabric and essence of the UK if left unchallenged.

PART I

An examination of XR style language used in RSPB, National Trust & Climate Coalition Charities

The first thing that is striking is the homogeneous language adopted across the websites (respected and trusted by many), be this RSPB, National Trust, The Climate Coalition etc. and that this is remarkably similar to that of Extinction Rebellion (and its offshoots Just Stop Oil & Insulate Britain) who as a 'climate emergency movement' used eschatological demagoguery, made demands of the government to pass and implement laws and used a battling cry for citizen's assemblies from 2018 onward <https://extinctionrebellion.uk/about/>. Generally, at the time, the public disliked the disruption and militantism and XR remained a fringe group or so it seemed - it appeared that the British public and in particular middle England were not going to be joining the extremist environmental movement any time soon. Cornwall Council was the first to give into XR's demands and declared a climate emergency in 2019 which was based on blatantly incorrect information and hysteria but this nevertheless set the ball officially rolling with the support and endorsement of people like David Attenborough who is a well respected and trusted British 'icon' with great appeal across the demographics.

The People's Plan for Nature (PPFN) according to the World Economic Forum (WEF) website

Looking at the WEF website this is what transpires:

'David Attenborough has inspired the UK to create a People's Plan for Nature (PPFN). Sir David's latest nature documentary series 'Wild Isles', has inspired a campaign called PPFN in the UK, which includes 26 actions needed urgently to reverse the decline of the natural world. Prior to this in 2019 Prince William and David Attenborough called to 'protect the planet through a new deal for nature' at Davos which led to the making of the TV series 'Wild Isles' in 2023 with the BBC about the UK. Three conservation charities hence came together, the WWF-UK, National Trust and British RSPB for the first time to create a follow up documentary 'Saving our Wild Isles' - narrated by David Attenborough. 'This TV series spawned a unique 'Save our Wild Isles' campaign and crowdsourced a set of recommendations for nature's recovery in a People's Plan for Nature'.

At the same time the WEF Global Risk Report 2023 put environmental risk/biodiversity loss and ecosystem collapse as the 4th biggest risk in the next 10 years.

Blue Print projects for PPFN & Funding

Previous projects acted as a blue print for this PPFN eg. Cairngorms Connect and the Lundy Island No Take Zone (IUCN) with the PPFN setting out its recommendations with 26 actions needed urgently to reverse the decline of the natural world from the creation of a UK-wide Assembly for Nature to league tables for nature-friendly businesses.

Cairngorms Connect is funded by ARCADIA which was set up by Anna Rausing, the Tetra pack heiress, <https://arcadiahfund.org.uk/highlights/arcadia-joins-the-protecting-our-planet-challenge> who have pledged \$5 Billion and who set up the Endangered Landscapes and Seascape Programme (ELP) managed by the Cambridge Conservation Initiative. The ELP is supported by the RSPB, Wildland, Forrest & Land Scotland and NatureScot.

Lundy Island No Take Zone is funded by Natural England and acts as a case study and blue print to show how the sea recovers when humans are controlled and not given access – a worrying precedent if it was to inform future policy of large areas of the country being declared off limits for the British public for the declared aim to save nature.

Duchy of Cornwall Foreshore & Riverbed rights & the Roll out of the People's Plan for Nature (PPFN)

This is perhaps an appropriate point to have a look at the Duchy of Cornwall and what it owns in terms of foreshore and riverbeds- as well as landholdings of course – see map: <https://whooownsengland.org/2017/03/15/what-land-does-the-duchy-of-cornwall-own/>.

The map shows that 60-70% of the foreshore is owned by the crown, the implication being that if the PPFN is rolled out - presumably with royal approval -, 60 plus % of the Cornish foreshore could be closed off to the public to help 'save nature'. As the National Trust owns large areas of the immediate coastal land next to the foreshore and much farmland beyond that, plus Natural England having declared vast areas as SSSIs in the past 4-5 years, it is not hard to see how large parts of the countryside could be closed to the public or be so heavily green taxed to live in that only the select few can - all to protect nature, of course. West Penwith in Cornwall is a good example for this to be a real potential, and indeed by its geography the whole of Cornwall is vulnerable in this regard – an easy testing ground so to speak.

PPFN - The RAPID Democracy Process - according to Jon Alexander of the New Citizens Project

The People's Plan for Nature is a result of a pioneering two-phase project gathering responses in a national consultation and through a UK-wide People's Assembly for Nature, designed by the New Citizenship Project based on a process called RAPID Democracy inspired by Bain & Company's Rapid decision making model (2000s). Rapid Democracy splits out the roles of decision making in democracy more clearly across the people that need to be involved'. This ideology is further informed by Jon Alexander's book 'Why the key to fixing everything is all of us'.

<https://www.newcitizenproject.com/>

The WEF website sheds some more light on this with this article from 19/4/2023, as part of the WEF Centre for Nature and Climate. The article was penned by Jon Alexander, Co-Founder of the New Citizen's Project which put together the framework for the People's Plan for Nature. Jon Alexander was approached by Helen Meech in her capacity as Head of Movement Building in the RSPB but who is now the Executive Director of The Climate Coalition since September 2023 (see below for more information). According to Jon:

'Helen came to my business partner and me and told us that the RSPB was working with the BBC, WWF and NT on a new David Attenborough led documentary series about British nature, called 'Wild Isles'. His response to her was: 'What's the plan for how to drive impact off the back of it?' He continues: ... I had known Helen for a long time but at the time of the 'Blue Planet' series we were still in an era of individualism so could only achieve individual behaviour changes. So, what we wanted to do with 'Wild Isles' was, what if this might create a movement when actually we could cohere the political will of the British people for action on nature, tapping into the collective agency, not just individual agency?'

<https://www.weforum.org/stories/2023/04/attenborough-people-s-plan-nature-uk/>

In other words, Jon Alexander appears to be saying, how can we manipulate, nudge and reframe people to agree and take ownership of what we want them to do!?

It was thus decided what the outcome of the RAPID democracy citizen's assembly process would be to develop a set of recommendations, not just for national governments but also for local government, businesses and even community groups themselves to adopt, hence the 26 recommendations of the People's Plan for Nature. This interim output from the citizen's assembly is planned to be followed up to 'see what NGOs can do, what councils and local government can do, what business can do and use those publicly generated asks as a way to cohere the energy.'

<https://medium.com/citizen-thinking/what-if-democracy-was-rapid-d8d095bf4844>

A closer examination as to the legitimacy of the Process of the Citizen's Assembly consultation for the PPFN

The above process warrants a closer examination and this is what the People's Plan for Nature says about it (Page 16/17 respectively):

https://wild-isles.cdn.prismic.io/wild-isles/6d07f66b-312c-4b4c-9f1e-b8b11370af32_PPFN-Report-Final+%28new%29.pdf

*'The assembly aims to be statistically reflective of the population but **is not a large survey or referendum**. Instead, the recommendations reflect a proxy of wider public opinion. If the wider public had an opportunity to undertake a similar process of learning and deliberation, could access a curated and diverse range of lived experiences to draw on,*

*and were facilitated to explore evidence from multiple experts, **their conclusions would be likely to be similar to those of the Assembly,***

In other words, this Citizen Assembly exercise is meaningless and can not be called representative of the opinions and will of the British people. It would appear fraudulent to claim that it is more than it is, especially as this has now been adopted by major charities including the Climate Coalition which boasts 20 million members by default being an umbrella organisation for over 130 charities including the National Trust and the RSPB. See below for more information.

In practice, the Citizens' Assembly process was conducted as follows:

277 people across the UK applied to be part of the Assembly, 110 were selected for the Assembly, 107 started the process, 103 people finished the process. Age ranged from 16 plus and ticked all diversity groups and all were generously supported financially, including childcare etc. so as to make sure that they could complete the process. In total, participants attended 4 two day weekends and this culminated in the 26 recommendations of the PPFN.

In other words, we are led to believe that 103 people including minors are representative for 70 million Brits in Scotland, Wales, Northern Ireland and England and capable of grasping the vast topic of climate change, impact on the environment and net zero in a total of 8 short days. In reality, it is more likely that carefully selected, non representative people were indoctrinated by 'experts' and misled into sanctioning the already decided on (by WEF, David Attenborough, WWF, National Trust and RSPB) 26 point manifesto - in other words a bog standard, rubber stamping marketing exercise where participants only decide whether they want it in pink rather than purple, instead of whether they want it in the first place or not, or whether they want something entirely different.

Here is the link to the 99 page People's Plan for Nature Report - the 26 recommendations and funders are on pages 93-98. The People's Plan for Nature, and the People's Assembly for Nature, is funded by the Esmée Fairbairn Foundation, Samworth Foundation and the European Climate Foundation.

https://wild-isles.cdn.prismic.io/wild-isles/6d07f66b-312c-4b4c-9f1e-b8b11370af32_PPFN-Report-Final+%28new%29.pdf

Significance of the above & the PPFN for Britain - the Misuse of Charitable Status for political aims?

So, what is the significance of all of the above and in particular the blatantly non-independently derived and non-representative 26 recommendations of the People's Plan for Nature?

1. These non democratically derived and biased recommendations and demands are supposed to become policy on national and local level and pressure is building from charities that they will.
2. Since the recommendations and demands of the PPFN have been made in 2023, the PPFN is appearing on charities' websites, taking centre stage, eg:
<https://www.rspb.org.uk/whats-happening/news/peoples-plan-for-nature-report>:

To quote the RSPB – patronised by King Charles III - who decidedly sound like Extinction Rebellion:

'The people have spoken. Now everyone needs to act.'

The UK's first ever People's Plan for Nature has been published and the message is clear – we need urgent and immediate action now from every part of society to protect and restore nature. With input from thousands of people from across the UK, the pioneering People's Plan calls on businesses, charities, communities, farmers, governments and organisations to take action to prevent further damage to our wildlife and habitats which are being pushed to the brink.'

This of course is an absolute lie as only 103 carefully selected people misled by the 'experts' have in fact spoken. For the RSPB to make such a claim potentially amounts to fraud and misleading its paying members - all 1.2 million of them - who believe that they can trust what the charity is telling them. This would appear to be a political statement by the RSPB and should perhaps be raised with the charity commission as a matter of urgency.

The same can be observed for the National Trust who went so far as to commission a 109 page long report in which they claim:
<https://nt.global.ssl.fastly.net/binaries/content/assets/website/national/pdf/national-trust-response-to-the-peoples-plan-for-nature-high-res.pdf>

'The People's Assembly for Nature was the UK's first nationwide citizen's assembly on nature. It brought together 103 people from all corners of the UK, representing a wide range of ages, communities, experiences and perspectives. These people voluntarily gave up four weekends to learn about the state of nature in the UK, consider ways that it can be protected and restored, then set out a bold vision and action plan for the future. Assembly members heard from a wide range of experts

- farmers to ecologists to economics professors – about the different factors that have led to the current depleted state of key species and habitats, as well as evidence and examples of ways that we can tackle and reverse this trend. Assembly members were also able to reflect on the outcomes of the National Conversation, which called on members of the public to share their thoughts about what nature means to them, their hopes for the future, and examples they've seen of people making a difference for nature in their communities. The People's Plan for Nature, published on 24th March 2023, was the culmination of the Assembly's work. It is full of hope, but it is also piercingly honest about how devastating the declines in nature are here in the UK, and how big solutions are urgently needed to tackle these declines. Expressed in the voices of the Assembly's participants, it lays down a powerful challenge to governments, businesses, charities, communities and individuals, to make the step changes we need to secure the health of our environment, and ourselves - now and for future generation. As a co-sponsor, alongside WWF and RSPB, the National Trust was an enabler of this process but not a participant. the Assembly was delivered at arms' length with the help of Involve, who facilitated the Assembly's meetings and deliberations, with the support of an independent advisory group and academic leads Professor Natalie Seddon and Professor Pete Smith.

The People's Plan belongs to every citizen in the UK, not to the three charities. Every UK government, business, institution, community and individual should consider this powerful plan, and wherever possible respond. Some of the recommendations the citizens make reflect well-established consensus; others are new,

and innovative, and some go beyond what any of our organisations have ever considered. The majority will need serious government support, funding and multi-sector engagement to deliver in practice. We hope that in writing this response to the People's Plan, we encourage others to do the same: engage seriously with the calls to action, think deeply about what we can all do to translate their vision into reality, and then act.

Again, the same overreach and politicisation as in the RSPB can be observed in the National Trust and the blatant over inflation of the non-representative, undemocratically derived PPFN recommendations to be pushed through at government level is of concern.

The role of the charity Climate Coalition - 20 million British members who are unwittingly signed up for their enslavement through eco policy

In this context a closer look at the charity, The Climate Coalition, reveals the following. Above it was mentioned that Helen Meech- who was then Movement Building Director of the RSPB - approached Jon Alexander to get his assistance in getting the People's Plan for Nature pushed through via RAPID Democracy and a Citizen's Assembly. When this process had been completed, she became Executive Director in September 2023 of the frighteningly large and opaque Climate Coalition which boasts 20 million unwitting members in the UK as it appears to be an umbrella of ca. 130 UK charities including the NT, RSPB, WWF, Faith groups, Oxfam and the Women's Institute! About themselves they state:

'We bring together our members and partners to become more than the sum of our parts. Together, we are able to mobilise our collective memberships and supporters, millions of ordinary people, to become an unstoppable political force.'

<https://www.theclimatecoalition.org/about-us>

This is an extraordinary statement and raises the question why this organisation is enjoying charitable status when it calls itself a political force. Whilst the Climate Coalition so far has not officially adopted 'The people have spoken, now everyone needs to act' mantra, it will presumably only be a matter of time and they can then claim - falsely - that they have the mandate of the 20 million people who make up the Climate Coalition through membership of 130 charities. This needs to be exposed as a matter of urgency perhaps, before the Climate Coalition can go public with fraudulently subscribing all 20 million Brits to have sanctioned the PPFN eco agenda.

The Climate Coalition goes on to say about itself:

'The Climate Coalition is the UK's largest group of people dedicated to action on the climate and nature crisis. Along with our sister organisations Climate Cymru and Stop Climate Chaos Scotland, we are a group of over 130 organisations with a combined supporter base of 20 million people. The Climate Coalition is the operating name of the Climate Movement'.

Patrick Begg who is presently the National Trust Outdoor & Natural Resources Director is a board member of the Climate Coalition. He is the author of the 2023 report by the National Trust 'A Climate for Change' calling on all political parties to ramp up progress on adaptation by introducing new legislation that recognises the importance of **adapting buildings, coastline and countryside** to cope with the impacts of climate change. What

does this mean, in particular with regards of what eg. the Duchy of Cornwall owns in terms of the foreshore & riverbeds etc. and honouring centuries old rights of public access and rights to roam for example?

Does the well meaning British public know that most charities they support have signed them up for life limiting eco policy?

It must be asked just how many ordinary British people who take out annual membership of eg. the RSPB, the NT or the Women's Institute realise that they are being signed up for militant eco zealotry and their own enslavement, instead of flower arranging, doing garden bird surveys and visiting a stately home on a rainy Sunday afternoon. It would appear that the unsuspecting public is being misused by the charities who hide behind the large numbers of membership (taken out for the original decades old shared mission statements that we all know) to claim a mandate for taking unnecessarily extremist environmental action that in reality does not exist.

Misuse of environmental legislation – eg. the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981- The tip of the Iceberg of what is to come if/when the Climate & Nature Bill (CAN) is passed - Empowered charities showing their true colours?

It would appear that we have reached a point whereby national charities have been infiltrated by the militant eco mindset (this is of course a smokescreen as it is ultimately not about saving the planet) and misuse the goodwill of the British public who are their unsuspecting members, to claim that they have a mandate to push through extremist eco policy when none such exists.

Extinction Rebellion or their offshoots Just Stop Oil and Insulate Britain will never appeal to the bulk of the British public, so cynically the same militant mindset has been made mainstream through the old familiar and trusted suspects of BBC, David Attenborough and the biggest charities with regard to number of subscribers, ie. National Trust and RSPB.

The RSPB stands out for being particularly bold and XRish and taking the lead in pushing the 'demands' of the PPFN. Alarmingly, there are now cases reported in 2024 where the RSPB, National Trust and Natural England appear to feel empowered to single out and threaten certain activities such as climbing or hang-gliding, or specific groups of people with the police and criminal prosecution under already existing laws such as the Wildlife & Countryside Act if they walk on public footpaths as part of a guided walk, for example, in areas open to and well used by the general public, or reporting well established businesses to the police when their operations have not changed in the past years and have no measurably negative impact on nature and wildlife. This appears to be done so as to have such activities or businesses closed down and removed from parts of the countryside the charities are now seeing as predominately there for nature, rather than open to the public as they have been to date - this is clearly a shift in mindset and shows what is to come to all of us if this is not challenged. The mindset that has been nurtured in these charities is now revealing itself in cases such as these where - up until recently - inane, perfectly normal and legitimate behaviours/activities are now being criminalised by those pushing for eg. the implementation of the People's Plan for Nature or the Climate &

Nature (CAN) Bill, chipping away at centuries old rights and freedoms, including access to the countryside.

Such a potential misuse of the law by charities such as the National Trust and the RSPB to keep people out of areas previously open to the public could be the tip of a very large iceberg of what is about to break out for the whole of the UK and it would be important that the misled and unsuspecting public who are regarded as giving their silent consent to this and thus their own enslavement through taking out membership of these charities is made aware of this.

The British public is being reframed in the same manner as during Covid

As the above demonstrates, the democratic process and its long established institutions have been dismantled and every nook and cranny infiltrated, hiding in non accountable bodies such as charities which have been taken over partly or entirely. This is the same psychological manipulation and re-framing as during the Covid era - the British public is once again under a deliberate attack where even going for a walk in the countryside will be seen as ecocide and killing wildlife including the birds (Granny), with people being led into the same mindset of policing themselves and others for no real reason at all other than control and power.

.

PART II

The National Trust – The vital Statistics of this Organisation enjoying Charitable Status

The National Trust needs closer examination with regards to its role in pushing for the net zero/environmental agenda through commissioning, guiding and adopting the aforementioned People's Plan for Nature and by lobbying for the upcoming Climate & Nature (CAN) Private Members' Bill to become law and mandate in the early part of 2025 (see below for an examination of CAN and the implications if/when this bill is passed).

The National Trust - Royal Approval & Mission Statement – 5.38 million members

Patronised by King Charles III, the Trust has operated for over 125 years under the self declared mission statement:

'To look after places of Historic Interest and Natural Beauty permanently for the Benefit of the Nation across England, Wales and Northern Ireland for everyone, forever'.

In 2024 the NT boasts 5.38 million members (2.78 million memberships) with an annual income of £723.8 million, the majority of which is derived from membership fees. As one of the largest landowners in the UK, the charity also owns ca 20% of coastal land and refers to itself as **'We're one big family'**.

<https://www.nationaltrust.org.uk/who-we-are/about-us/fascinating-facts-and-figures>

The National Trust – A vast organisation with Common Purpose

The National Trust has 14,000 staff, 4,000 of whom are seasonal employees, plus an army of 53,000 volunteers, making it similar in size to the British Army which in comparison is currently made up of 75,000 personnel.

The code of conduct for this army of paid and unpaid staff is set out in eg. the Trust's leaflet 'Our values & behaviour' which declares the Common Purpose Values and requests employees to 'share our common purpose'.

https://www.nationaltrustjobs.org.uk/files/6915/0487/3733/Annex_C_-_Values_Behaviours.pdf

<https://namastepublishing.co.uk/unmasking-common-purpose/>

National Trust Director General – An Environmentalist who claims to speak for the 5.38 million members

Since 2018 the Trust has been led by the environmentalist, Hilary McGrady, as the Director General on an annual salary of £197,000 who joined the National Trust in 2006. In 2020 McGrady announced that the NT would reach net zero carbon emissions by 2030 and she collaborated with penning an open letter to the then Prime Minister in July 2023 voicing alarm about the UK Government's environmental policy. In this letter she stated that the **Trust's membership supported her in speaking up 'for the future of life on this one precious planet'**. A further eight executives of the National Trust are receiving annual salaries of £100,000.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/National_Trust

National Trust – Summary of Vital Statistics

In summary, what these vital statistics of the National Trust show is that this well established, loved, trusted and respected British icon with a clear original mission statement and commitment to preserving history and nature in equal measure for all, largely unnoticed by the 5.38 million members has morphed into a huge and powerful political environmental pressure group, headed by an environmentalist with Common Purpose who claims to speak for all of the 5.38 million British unsuspecting, paying members. All this is given the seal of Royal approval and it is doubtful that the large membership base has any idea of what is done in their name and what is claimed that they have consented to in terms of extremist environmental demands. This is examined in detail below.

The carefully placed Stepping Stones from the Climate Change Act 2008, to Extinction Rebellion extremist demands in 2018, to The Climate & Nature (CAN) Private Members Bill potentially destined to becoming law in 2025 – The Role of the National Trust as an Environmental Pressure group

As outlined above, the People's Plan for Nature (PPFN), published in March 2023, (commissioned by the National Trust, RSPB and WWF) was the result of the non-

democratic and pre-determined RAPID (pseudo) Democracy process of putting 103 - by Sortition - carefully selected members of the British public through 8 short days of a typical, rubber stamping market research exercise, where participants basically rank ordered 26 recommendations in their perceived importance, directed by the 'experts'. This group of 103 people were declared to be a Citizen's Assembly with the outcome of the process being exaggerated and declared to be representative of the views and wishes of the whole of the 70 million strong, unsuspecting British population. The thus developed slogan and Extinction Rebellion style battle cry '**The people have spoken. Now everyone needs to act**' is now widely used by charities eg. the RSPB and encapsulates and expresses clearly the underlying mindset of environmental hysteria and eschatological demagoguery.

The National Trust promptly used the People's Plan for Nature to write the aforementioned 109 page long report 'The National Trust Response to the People's Plan for Nature', again over-inflating the market exercise outcome based on the 103 people weak 'Citizen's Assembly' and claiming:

The People's Plan belongs to every citizen in the UK, not to the three charities. Every UK government, business, institution, community and individual should consider this powerful plan, and wherever possible respond. Some of the recommendations the citizens make reflect well-established consensus; others are new, and innovative, and some go beyond what any of our organisations have ever considered. The majority will need serious government support, funding and multi-sector engagement to deliver in practice.

<https://nt.global.ssl.fastly.net/binaries/content/assets/website/national/pdf/national-trust-response-to-the-peoples-plan-for-nature-high-res.pdf>

The National Trust AGM on 2 November 2024 – Resolution No 3 to support the Climate & Nature (CAN) Bill passes with support in favour by 1.3% of National Trust members only

Only three resolutions were tables to be voted on during the recent National Trust AGM. All 5.38 million members were eligible to vote either online or in person.

These were the resolutions:

1. Members' resolution about plant based food choices at catering outlets
2. Members' resolution about strengthening the response to the climate and ecological emergency
3. Members' resolution about the Climate and Nature Bill

It is immediately striking that all three resolutions are political environmental and there is a conspicuous absence of resolution topics one might have expected to have been tabled eg. those concerning historic buildings, how to allocate funds etc., given that this is the well loved National Trust and not the Green Party or XR. The question must be asked about who selected which resolutions were tabled and why only green politics issues were selected to be voted on. This seems to once again highlight that the National Trust as we know it has been hi-jacked by extremist environmental campaigners and has decidedly crossed the line from a charity into a political pressure and activist group.

National Trust AGM – Fake democracy – fake claims to have the people’s mandate

All three resolutions were passed, with a split of approximately 80% to 20% in favour for resolution 2 and 3. However, overall voter participation was only about 1.4%, ie. only ca 77,000 of the total of 5.38 million National Trust members voted at all, with only ca. 1.3% being in favour of pushing for the climate change and ecological political agenda to be taken to another level with political mandate being sought through the upcoming Climate and Nature Bill in parliament.

<https://www.nationaltrust.org.uk/services/media/2024-agm-results-press-release>

The lack of voter participation reflected in the minute 1.4% participation though, clearly shows that the National Trust **does not have its members’ mandate** to pursue this course of action, especially as this is largely funded through membership fees from the 5,303,000 members who did not take part in the voting and thus did not give their consent for these political resolutions.

<https://nt.global.ssl.fastly.net/binaries/content/assets/website/national/pdf/2024-agm-booklet.pdf>

The Supporting statement from the National Trust on the second resolution makes this point very clearly and reads as follows:

*Our National Trust has declared climate change to be ‘the greatest threat to the coastline, countryside and historic buildings in our care’. More recently the Trust’s weather and wildlife review for the year ending 2023 sounded the alarm for UK wildlife; reporting that unpredictable weather patterns have thrown nature into chaos. During 2022 and 2023 we have witnessed the gathering pace of climate change. Average global warming of 1.5°C above pre-industrial temperatures is the reality in which we now live, but we also live in the ‘not yet’, where we have an opportunity to shape what the future will look like. This resolution is our response. **We, National Trust members, must do more than turn up, pay our annual fees and make the occasional donation. We now give licence to the Trust to focus a much greater share of resources for the defence of nature and together we offer our time and energy to that cause.***

Apart from the strangely religious, cult like undertones of this extraordinary statement, it clearly shows the contempt that those who tabled the resolution have for the over 5 million hard working, ordinary members who just want to be able to enjoy a day out visiting National Trust attractions to enjoy family time and relax. The pledge to ‘*We, the National Trust members give licence to the Trust*’ sounds like a pledge of allegiance to a feudal lord, a sort of worship at the alter of net zero and climate change hysteria perhaps and this should make any sane person who is a National Trust member rethink whether they want to be associated with this at all. Again, only 5 people tabled this resolution but they seem to feel that it is their right to speak for all 5.38 million members – this is extremely concerning and is reminiscent of underlying extremist mindsets that in the past drove Marxist and Cultural Revolutions.

The supporting statement from the National Trust on the third resolution reads as follows:

*We call upon our Trustees and officers to strengthen the Trust's response to the worsening climate-nature crisis by supporting the cross-party backed Climate and Nature Bill, if or when it is reintroduced in the new 2024–2029 Parliament (having been previously introduced with cross-party support in the last parliamentary session). We ask that the Trust lends its support for this **crucial, new legislation** to ensure that we, members, Trustees and officers, play our full role in advocating for policies that will better protect the places we love for current and future generations.*

Our Trust has called for more ambitious policies to prepare society for climate change and to protect our country's much-loved heritage, landscapes and communities. Across the countryside, cities, towns, villages and coastline, communities are experiencing the devastating impacts of climate change and nature loss. During the last storm season, 10 storms battered our nation, with Storms Babet and Ciarán damaging multiple Trust sites. Indeed, a Trust report, A Climate for Change, demonstrates our proud record of leading the charge in terms of climate adaptation, but the other crucial side of the coin is climate change mitigation. As global temperatures continue to break records, we call on the Trust to end our support to efforts that will reduce the UK's greenhouse gas emissions – which are as important as adapting to our changing climate – by backing the Climate and Nature Bill. Without efforts to reduce emissions at source, we cannot, as a Trust, state that we are fulfilling our duties to both protect our historic landscapes from future harm, and properly care for the Trust's beautiful, nature-rich sites.

As the Director-General said, 'without action to restore nature to help us adapt to climate change now, future Governments will have to grapple with the escalating consequences of plummeting food production to property damage from increased flooding'. Our Director-General is right: we need to be resilient and adaptable, but we must also tackle the root causes of the intertwined climate and nature crises.

We have a responsibility, as a Trust, to do all we can to advocate for long-term, science-led laws that will reduce the UK's greenhouse gas emissions and reverse the destruction of nature – as well as, and alongside – the Trust's commendable efforts to help the UK adapt to our changing climate and the knock-on damage that global warming is causing to Trust sites and the wider natural world. The current, unambitious and insufficient path that the UK is currently on does not rise to the challenges we face.

We therefore call on the Trust to lend its full support to the cross-party, UK-wide campaign for the Climate and Nature Bill; a Private Members' Bill that has been supported by over 180 MPs and Peers from all main parties, and which requires the Government to deliver a joined-up plan that would:

1. reduce our greenhouse gas emissions in line with the Paris Agreement, and 2. halt and reverse the destruction of nature by 2030. We call on the Trust to join, support and amplify the nationwide campaign for the bold, science-led plan offered by the Climate and Nature Bill. *The Director-General was correct to say that 'we need to accelerate efforts to tackle the nature and climate crisis. ...we can no longer fiddle around the edges.... It's not too late to act. But we need to do it now.'*

Again, the National Trust's position is definitively political and pro-active and makes bold claims that are in fact not evidence led, simply untrue and not consensus science at all. In other words, the fundamental axioms that underpin the Climate Emergency claims are deeply flawed, some potentially fraudulent, need urgent challenging and are in fact being contested by thousands of scientists worldwide.

<https://clintel.org/>
<https://co2coalition.org/>
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=s3Tfxiuo-oM&t=1364s>
<https://www.forbes.com/sites/jamestaylor/2011/11/23/climategate-2-0-new-e-mails-rock-the-global-warming-debate/>

The Recommendations of the board of NT trustees goes even further demanding a Living Planet Act to become law and states:

*'Having reviewed the scope of the Bill, Trustees are supportive, but strongly encourage the backers of this proposed legislation **to go further and champion a more integrated legislative proposal.***

We would particularly like to see the proponents of the Climate and Nature Bill working directly with the World Wide Fund for Nature which has proposed a Living Planet Act which seeks to tackle the triple challenge of protecting our climate, nature and food security together, so that a single legislative proposal – which can gain widespread support – is brought forward.

Trustees therefore recommend that members vote for the resolution, on the understanding that we would like to see a stronger and more comprehensive legislative framework put forward if the Bill is tabled again.'

Such a proposed **Living Planet Act** would have the potential to wipe out farming as we know it altogether leading to extreme food insecurity amongst others and such proposals should therefore also be closely monitored and vigorously opposed.

The National Trust Climate & Nature Bill campaign - Extinction Rebellion and their offshoots Just Stop Oil and Insulate Britain gone mainstream – The same masters?

At this point a reminder of XR's claims (XR is a UK funded, global political organisation not a charity) and demands may shed some more light on this clear change in the National Trust from the original mission statement that we are all familiar with and that was clearly apolitical, to a political environmental pressure and action group, calling for life changing and life limiting draconian laws to be imposed on the British people – allegedly for 'their own good and to save the planet'.

The BBC stated the following in 2022, <https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-48607989>:

'It (XR) says life on Earth is in crisis and facing a mass extinction. It wants governments to declare a "climate and ecological emergency" and take immediate action.

The group uses an hourglass inside a circle as its logo, to represent time running out for many species.

In the UK, Extinction Rebellion has three main demands:

- *The government must declare a climate "emergency"*
- *The UK must legally commit to reducing carbon emissions to net zero by 2025*
- *A citizens' assembly must be formed to "oversee the changes"*

<https://rebellion.global/>

Whilst Councils around the UK have given in to XR's demands and declared 'Climate Emergencies' with Cornwall Council being one of the first in 2019, The UK government to date has not yet done so. The pressure from the National Trust together with other charities to pass the upcoming Climate & Nature Bill in early 2025 will **require** the Starmer Labour government to do so – a requirement the government will be all too happy to oblige - no doubt - being able to claim, fraudulently, that **'The (British) People have spoken. Now everyone must act.'**

It would seem fair to point out that there is no discernable difference between the language used as well as the declared aims and objectives of both NT and Extinction Rebellion in 2024.

The difference is, as outlined earlier, that XR is regarded by the bulk of the British public as an extremist organisation they would not want to be associated with, whilst they are happy to join the good old trusted National Trust based on the original apolitical mission statement, unawares that this mission has been changed and the Trust is now solely driving a political environmental agenda. It could be seen as cynical that the 5.38 million British NT members behind their backs are claimed to support this XR eco- zealotry by the Trust board and directors based on a 1.3% total of members only having endorsed this at the recent AGM.

Zero Hour Campaign – over 1000 charities, politicians and faith groups together lobbying for the Climate & Nature Bill – National Trust & RSPB involvement

The ongoing Zero Hour Campaign which is clearly political and driven by an XR and JSO mindset brings together a vast number of charities, including the National Trust and the RSPB to push for the CAN Bill so as to give perceived 'legitimacy' to the Labour government to declare a climate emergency with all the draconian powers that come with it, potentially justifying a partial or total Covid Health style lockdown from 2025 onwards – all to save the environment of course - allegedly. What the Climate Change Act 2008 failed to achieve in making it a legal requirement for the government to implement XR style eco policy, the Climate & Nature Bill (CAN), if passed, will mandate – claiming falsely that this is the will of the British people in true Marxist style.

<https://www.zerohour.uk/nationaltrust/>

It would appear prudent perhaps for a legal challenge to be mounted as a matter of urgency as to the false axioms the Climate & Nature Bill is based on and to show that the claims the bill makes are incorrect and non-scientific (this is covered in more detail below).

Extinction Rebellion, BBC presenters, National Trust, RSPB and many other charities unite to save the world under Restore Nature Now

On 22 June 2024 British charities including the National Trust and the RSPB visibly showed their real political colours by marching with XR through London under the umbrella of 'Restore Nature Now'.

The political rally was also supported by the BBC presenter, Chris Peckham, who is quoted as having stated recently:

'But if anyone here is banking with Barclays, then I suggest you stick your head in a bucket of fuel and set fire to it,'.

<https://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-13752553/Chris-Packham-Barclays-customers-stick-heads-bucket-fuel-set-fire.html>

Etienne Stott MBE, Olympian and Extinction Rebellion UK spokesperson said: *"I'm really excited that Extinction Rebellion UK is going to be out on the streets with such a great*

variety of friends and allies who are all passionate about protecting and restoring nature. Biodiversity loss, habitat destruction and climate breakdown are now at breaking point. I'm deeply worried and I know huge numbers of others are too. The only way we are going to do anything about it is if we all come together and pull in the same direction. This demonstration, a follow up from The Big One last year, is a start to bringing this fight to the mainstream and getting everyone who cares about our planet and all life on earth to bring about radical and urgent change. Restoring nature will be a key consideration for the increasingly vital citizens' assembly on the climate and nature emergencies that we have been demanding from the government since 2019.

<https://extinctionrebellion.uk/2024/04/24/extinction-rebellion-unites-with-wildlife-and-climate-campaigners-for-biggest-march-to-save-natural-world/>

Based on the above, there can now be no more doubt that the National Trust and the RSPB as well as countless other charities are no longer charities but political pressure groups and their charitable status and privileges should be thus withdrawn as a matter of urgency.

Summary of the Stepping stones to get the seal of legitimacy to possibly impose climate & nature lockdowns on UK citizens from 2025 onwards

The above gave a brief insight into how the process of making contested eco extremism binding law, that has to be implemented, and how this is being unfolded through to and leading to eg the CAN Bill.

From the Paris Agreement and the Climate Change Act 2008, to psychological manipulation and re-framing of the British public through eg. the Blue Planet and follow on series, to XR's 2018 demands to declare a climate emergency, through project fear using eschatological demagoguery that our own actions are to blame for climate change and that we are all going to die if we don't change our lives drastically, to the systematic infiltration and adoption of XR style Marxist ideology by many British charities, to large charities becoming powerful, political pressure and activist organisations influencing policy and politics – to the present moment in 2024/25 where the final chess move is planned to finally make eco-extremism a mandate in law via the Climate and Nature Bill (CAN); this process is a textbook Marxist exercise using tools of pseudo-democracy in the form of RAPID Democracy, Sortition, Citizens' Assemblies, propaganda, confusion and fear and all this is done claiming that '**THE PEOPLE HAVE SPOKEN. NOW EVERYONE MUST ACT**', ie. claiming the British people's mandate when none such exists.

Whilst deeply concerning, undemocratic, unconstitutional and sinister, the way the forces who have driven this Marxist ideology patiently to this point for the past decades would make Lenin, Stalin, Pol Pot, Mao and perhaps any king proud.

The evidence disseminated in this analysis would suggest that the UK is in the final stages of the preparatory phase of an eco-fascist revolution/dictatorship being rolled out bearing concerning similarities to eg. the Chinese Cultural Revolution. The consequences if this is allowed to go any further and to become mandate and binding law will be devastating to Britain for many generations to come without any real benefit or effect on the naturally changing climate materialising as is falsely claimed.

PART III

The Nature & Climate Bill (CAN) – An Enabling Act and a Call for Crippling Austerity on the Altar of Net Zero?

So, what's in the CAN (Climate & Nature Bill) and what legal and practical impact will it have on the British public if it is passed in early 2025? The following is a brief introduction to what the Bill aims to achieve and how far reaching it is.

Introduced as the Climate and Nature Bill, this Private Members' Bill will have its second reading on 24/1/2025. Its full title reads:

*“A Bill to **require** the Secretary of State to achieve climate and nature targets for the United Kingdom; to give the Secretary of State a **duty to implement** a strategy to achieve those targets; **to establish a Climate and Nature Assembly** to advise the Secretary of State in creating that strategy; to **give duties to the Committee on Climate Change and the Joint Nature Conservation Committee** regarding the strategy and targets; and for connected purposes.”*

The complete text of the bill can be read here:

<https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/bills/cbill/58-04/0192/230192.pdf>

Climate & Nature Lock-downs coming to a town near you if the proposed Climate & Nature Bill (CAN) is not stopped

Briefing Paper

November 2024

The Climate And Nature (CAN) Private Members' Bill - through its well funded, highly organised and apocalyptically titled 'Zero Hour campaign' - is on track to write 'Extinction Rebellion' and 'Just Stop Oil' type extreme Net Zero demands and policies into UK Law in 2025 whilst the majority of the UK public is unaware. Cynically, it is claimed that 'The People (sic you) have spoken. Now everyone needs to act.', meaning the Zero Hour campaign is claiming to have the British public's mandate for such unnecessary self-harm and enslavement policy when none such exists. It would appear that the proposals of the CAN Bill amount to what some might regard as treason and needs to be stopped from becoming law urgently.

If, or perhaps more likely when, it becomes law as the current trajectory suggests, the CAN Bill will change our lives forever in the most inhumane, immediate and catastrophic manner – unless we push back strongly and without delay now. The Bill will mandate (ie. make it a legal requirement) that net zero is achieved in the UK by 2030, sets an unrealistically low limit of total CO2 emissions for the UK that can not be exceeded, mandates that fossil fuel usage is stopped in its entirety and it will require that all businesses or activities that are deemed to be above an arbitrarily set threshold of CO2 emissions are closed or stopped instantly. Apart from the vast majority of British motorists

no longer being able to drive at all in the very near future, in practice and amongst others it will mean saying goodbye to, for example, your pet Dachshund who is calculated to be responsible for 6,541kg CO2 emissions per year – the equivalent to 98% of emissions for the average Brazilian citizen as is claimed by net zero proponents. <https://theconversation.com/how-cats-and-dogs-affect-the-climate-and-what-you-can-do-about-it-206812>

The Can Bill's climate targets are so unrealistic, unachievable and unscientific that it equates to King Cnut style absurdity of legislation to require the Secretary of State to achieve the unachievable, rendering such legislation null and void.

If we allow this monstrosity of an unconstitutional law to be passed on our watch, we will allow all centuries old and hard fought for civil, inalienable rights and freedoms to be swept away on the altar of having to achieve net zero in the next five years. The CAN Bill will lead to partial or full climate and nature lockdowns if not in name but in practice to be implemented with such previously unseen totalitarian powers that will make the Covid lockdowns seem tame. And, as net zero in reality can never be achieved, these lockdowns can never end, condemning us, our children and generations to come to unnecessary poverty, starvation, imprisonment and enslavement under the rule of Eco-fascism. In the Bill, all this will cynically be given the veneer of being the democratic will of the people through sinister Marxist strategies of Citizens and People's Assemblies using Sortition and RAPID Democracy with the predetermined outcome falsely declared to be listening and responding to people's requests and wishes – thus subverting the democratic process. The Can Bill will – if perhaps not by name – finally make it possible or require the government to declare a National Climate Emergency, triggering all the emergency powers that go with this.

With the vast majority of local councils having been persuaded by the likes of Extinction Rebellion protests since 2019 to declare Climate Emergencies, a lot of fertile ground and infrastructure has already been prepared to rapidly action the CAN Bill if/when it is passed, with many other organisations and bodies including charities also being on board with this extreme mindset ready to implement and enforce this climate ideology immediately.

The Climate And Nature (CAN) Private Members' Bill's second reading and first debate is set for 24 January 2025 shortly after the Christmas and New Year recess. Statistically, most Private Members' Bills that reach second reading become law – even without much support. The CAN Bill with its now huge and well funded support built up out of sight of the British public through the highly organised apocalyptically titled pressure group 'Zero Hour campaign' - whose funding mechanisms need urgent further investigation - further increases its likelihood of becoming UK law – unless we get informed, organised and start challenging it quickly through, for example, by writing to our MPs or bringing legal challenges eg on its non-compliance with Private Member 's Bill rules, as well as the false axioms the Bill is based on such as the claim that 'the science on climate change is settled'.

The presently proposed CAN Bill before parliament is the result of a six year long campaign and has been proposed under the previous titles of The Climate and Ecology Bill and the Climate and Ecological Emergency Bill.

The Zero Hour campaign site under 'Supporters' makes for chilling reading showing huge existing and growing support of: *'1,706 incredible organisations, politicians, and scientists from all parts of the UK are backing the Climate and Nature Bill, will you?'* - To date this includes: 188 MPs; 54 Peers; 6 Mayors; 8 MSPs; 3MSs; 15 Political Parties; 370 Councils; 231 Scientists; 32 Faith Leaders and 799 Organisations.

<https://www.zerohour.uk/supporters/>

Largely unnoticed, this huge support has been built up under British people's noses and against their will and all 650 MPs and all members of the House of Lords have been sent a 12 page XR style deeply flawed, biased and misleading briefing document to garner their support for the Bill. In the absence of an organised and informed counter brief also sent to all members of both parliamentary Houses showing that the climate science is neither settled nor indeed as set out by the Zero Hour campaign brief, it is likely that many MPs who are themselves not experts will fall for the climate alarmist propaganda and vote in favour, leading their constituencies into the abyss.

<https://www.zerohour.uk/downloads/climate-and-nature-bill-briefing.pdf>

A YouTube search for 'The Climate And Nature (CAN) Bill' or their 'Zero Hour' campaign brings up many professionally made campaign and progress videos, including lectures on how farmers and farming are the problem regarding the climate crisis.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=r3MqVU-dWDO>

Soberingly, to date there seems to be little or no opposition for what is possibly the most extreme and destructive piece of legislation ever faced by the British Public since the Covid Health Regulations. Attention must be drawn to this and opposing action taken urgently before it quietly slips into law – as did Hitler's 'Enabling Acts'.

So, what is in the CAN and why – if passed – will this mean that the UK will be subject to eco-fascism being rolled out legally and with immediate effect with all the predictable, catastrophic consequences for several generations to come?

The Long Title of The CAN Private Members' Bill is:

*"A Bill to **require** the United Kingdom to achieve climate and nature targets; to give the Secretary of State a **duty** to implement a strategy to achieve those targets; to **establish a Climate and Nature Assembly** to advise the Secretary of State in creating that strategy; to give **duties to the Committee on Climate Change and the Joint Nature Conservation Committee** regarding the strategy and targets; and for connected purposes."*

<https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/bills/cbill/58-04/0192/230192.pdf>

At the core of the CAN Bill is an unachievable King Cnut style clause. To have a proposed law that can not be fulfilled invalidates such a law. This is what the Bill says:

‘The Secretary of State must achieve the objective – to ensure that the UK reduces its overall contribution to global greenhouse gas emissions to net zero at a rate consistent with limiting the global mean increase to 1.5 degrees Celsius compared to Pre-industrial levels as defined by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC).’

If the side of the scientific debate that says CO2 emissions cause measurable global warming was correct, then the lack of control by the UK Secretary of State over the emissions of far larger economies in the world renders this legally binding target unachievable. If, however, the other side of the scientific debate that says that greenhouse gasses have no measurable effect above the natural cycles of climate change is correct, then this also renders the legally binding target unachievable. Either way, the target is unachievable fantasy which has no place in UK law or in the totalitarian control over the lives of UK citizens.

Here are some examples of what The CAN Bill aims to make UK Law and which would lead to the inevitable collapse of the UK economy and British way of life.

The wording of The CAN Bill itself acknowledges the massive and devastating effects there would be on the UK economy and its citizens and it raises the question whether this in itself is in contravention to parliamentary rules with regards to what Private Members’ Bills can propose and what exceeds their remit. For example:

‘Clause: 2. (5) The strategy must —(c) include financial support and retraining for people whose livelihoods and jobs will be affected by the proposed measures—including those measures that require transitioning out of industries characterised by high emissions and high impacts on ecosystems.’

Depending on how this is defined it will include and affect most jobs in the United Kingdom. Also, this financial and re-training support seems to only be for certain people not including ordinary working and professional people, small businesses and such like whose lives would be devastated. There is an absence in the Bill as to how ‘high emissions and high impacts’ are defined. Interpreting the Bill, the threshold definition of what defines ‘high’ could be arbitrarily set lower and lower for the UK, depending on whether the world overall global ‘allowed’ CO2 emission budget is exceeded. That means that if China decides to up its industrialisation and increases its CO2 emissions, the UK has to reduce its budget accordingly even if it means that the UK has to come to a complete standstill, including stopping food production – the CAN Bill will enshrine this into law and it will have to be enforced.

Clause: 3. (d) “ensuring the end of the exploration, extraction, export and import of fossil fuels by the United Kingdom as rapidly as possible;”

Within this rapid timescale it is unrealistic that there would be sufficient resources of time, money and trained workers to deliver non fossil fuel alternatives for all 70 million UK citizens by the legally binding 2030, hence there is likely to be a rapid, significant and devastating impact on people’s lives and on our economy. See eg: <https://co2coalition.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/09/Lindzen-Happer-Koonin-Affidavit-30-Nov-2023-1.pdf>

Food shortages due to Rewilding

The Bill will support 'Re-wilding' of a significant and large proportion of the UK which would further reduce productive farmland when the UK already only produces 60% of its food, currently having to import the balance. This alone is a risk to our food security. At the same time, the CAN Bill also supports cutting and outlawing the 'fossil fuel' powered shipping that brings in the top up food imports that are currently needed and that would need to increase if the UK's current food production is further curtailed as the CAN Bill will legally require. It is not difficult to anticipate the food shortages that will result and would inevitably lead to drastic food rationing and starvation. In this context it is noteworthy that the Liberal Democrat leader, Ed Davey, who took part in the recent Farmers' protest in London appearing to give his support against the inheritance tax on farmers, is one of the co-sponsors of the CAN Bill and is actively pushing for this to become law.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Climate_and_Nature_Bill

The 'Absolute Zero' report for UK Government makes for alarming reading on this topic, especially the centre graphic.

<https://ukfires.org/impact/publications/reports/absolute-zero/>

Nature Lockdowns

With its emphasis on letting nature and ecosystems recover and establishing new ones being a legally binding requirement, the CAN Bill will allow and require authorities and organisations to shut off large parts of the countryside and deny access to these, placing nature recovery above centuries old, established public access rights, the right to roam and freedom of movement for example. This would allow the National Trust – one of the biggest and most vocal supporters of the CAN Bill – who is also one of the largest land owners in the UK, to bar the public from huge areas of the countryside, for example, in effect potentially closing off most of the iconic Cornish Coast path and much of the Duchy of Cornwall – all to allegedly save nature, legally enforceable and required under the Bill.

<https://www.nationaltrust.org.uk/services/media/2024-agm-results-press-release>

The CAN Bill would require this kind of totalitarian action and make it a legal duty if, for example, the RSPB or Wildlife Trusts who are also vocal supporters of the CAN Bill wanted to clear the countryside of humans and their presently perfectly lawful activities to eg. create more habitats for birds, introduce new species or re-establish some that are extinct. <https://www.zerohour.uk/organisations/>. There will be no recourse for the British public as the CAN Bill – if left unchallenged – will supersede all previous rights and freedoms and enshrine ecocide into law, meaning that previously normal and legitimate activities such as enjoying a family walk in the countryside will be criminalised.

Bias and pre-determination in the 'science' around climate change as represented in the Can Bill as an Axiom

A number of clauses in the CAN Bill depend on statements relating to the Climate as if they are universally agreed consensus science and a truism when this is not the case. It

will be necessary for this to be debated and challenged as part of considering this proposed legislation. It will not be necessary for MPs to decide on the science or which side of the debate is correct, but simply to consider whether only one side of the scientific debate has been presented and is relied on in this Bill. The issue here is therefore, that whether there is or there is not any influence on climate from human emissions over and above the natural climate cycles such as the 'Milankovitch' Cycles, Solar Cycles and multi decadal ocean cycles, is presented in the draft legislation with the other side of the scientific debate omitted from being represented. To also present this other scientific view would be necessary to ensure balance and to avoid bias as is required for example by the Nolan Principles of public life.

To redress the balance and as an antidote to the climate anxiety, it would appear prudent to write to all MPs and draw their attention to this and share with them, for example, the excellent film: "Climate, The Movie – The Cold Truth" <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=A24fWmNA6IM> or the following informative websites: <https://co2coalition.org/> & <https://clintel.org/>

Examples of climate hypotheses wrongly presented as axioms and facts in the CAN Bill include:

1. (2) “*The objectives are to ensure that the United Kingdom—*

(a) reduces its overall contribution to global greenhouse gas emissions..”

It should be noted that many scientists assert that the acknowledged greenhouse effect, for example, of Carbon Dioxide (CO₂) tails off rapidly around current concentrations, being referred to as 'Saturated' hence having little additional warming effect by more CO₂ being added and why vastly higher past atmospheric CO₂ levels - when plant life evolved - do not correlate with past warming. That means that whilst at very much lower concentrations than today adding CO₂ would be a strong greenhouse gas, at current levels it has become a negligible greenhouse gas. Such crucial differentiation is omitted from this proposed legislation hence allowing the potential for pre-determination of MPs' decisions.

1. (2) (a) (i) “*limiting the global mean temperature increase to 1.5 degrees Celsius compared to pre-industrial levels as defined by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change;*”

To avoid bias and predetermination it would be helpful to MPs to know that the 'pre-industrial levels as defined by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change' (IPCC) were at the end of the 'Little Ice Age' natural cooling cycle so may be seen as a potentially pre-determining baseline. The warmest period in the current interglacial is generally acknowledged as being what is called 'The Holocene Thermal Maximum' before industrialisation or agriculture. Previous warm periods when life flourished including all species alive today or their ancestor species, are widely reported to have been up to 16C warmer. MPs should be made aware of this to show that a choice of past comparison can give a different and misleading understanding which is necessary to avoid bias and pre-determination as is required by the Nolan Principles of Public Life.

The subject of the above two points appear in various iterations through the text of the proposed Bill and similar comment therefore applies in each instance.

(ii) The Assembly:

3. Public involvement

(1) “The Secretary of State must, within three months of the passing of this Act, procure, by open tender, an expert independent body to establish a Climate and Nature Assembly (‘the Assembly’) comprising a representative sample of the United Kingdom population.”

and

(3) “The Assembly must consider relevant expert advice and publish its recommendations for measures to be included in the strategy.”

Apart from the glaringly obvious as to who defines ‘relevant expert advice’, to ensure the lack of bias and predetermination required by the Nolan principles of public life, it will be necessary for MPs to be guided to consider how reliable it may be that the above body would be ‘independent’ as the range of scientific opinion described above does not seem to be referenced, outlined or acknowledged in this proposed legislation. Similarly who will be tasked with ensuring that relevant expert advice is provided that avoids bias and pre-determination? Such imbalance and omission in the CAN Bill must be addressed before the Can Bill progresses further through Parliament, or rather it should be stopped outright.

(iii) Bias and pre-determination by omission in the ‘science’ around nature recovery as represented in the Can Bill

Regarding Nature recovery the ‘science’ presented again lacks crucial elements of balance that bring together the main issues in the Bill of CO2 and nature. For example the recent Study: “Global Plant Growth Surging alongside Carbon Dioxide” by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, US Department of Commerce, reports the clear and significant benefits of increasing CO2. This is generally accepted as being because current atmospheric CO2 levels are significantly below that when plants evolved and are suited to. This current depleted level of atmospheric CO2 is because over millions of years life has removed and locked up atmospheric CO2 in fossil fuels and sedimentary ocean floor rocks such as Limestone. Our emissions from using these releases this locked up ancient CO2 back to the atmosphere from where it originally came making human use part of the carbon cycle. Why is such understanding omitted from the CAN Bill? Such omission can be seen as omission and bias potentially leading to pre-determination hence is not consistent with the Nolan principles of public life and must be addressed before the Can Bill progresses further through Parliament.

Overall Conclusion:

For the above reasons The Climate & Nature (CAN) Private Members Bill is not considered fit to progress further in Parliament and must be withdrawn from parliamentary debate schedules.

Please share this Briefing Paper and inform others. Crucially, please without delay email your MP to request they attend The CAN Bill's second reading on 24 January 2025 to challenge and to object to what can only be seen as the most anti-human, anti-democratic, anti-civil rights, and pseudo scientific attempted coup including the subversion of the parliamentary process via Citizens Assemblies which if passed will result in the total final destruction of all that has made Britain what it is. Don't let them do this in your name.

APPENDIX

Observations on selected details of this proposed legislation:

(i) Bias and pre-determination in the 'science' around climate change as represented in the Can Bill as an Axiom

A number of clauses in the CAN Bill depend on statements relating to the Climate as if they are universally agreed consensus science when this is not the case. It will be necessary for this to be debated and challenged as part of considering this proposed legislation. It will not be necessary for MPs to decide on the science or which side of the debate is correct, but simply to consider whether only one side of the scientific debate has been presented and is relied on in this Bill. The issue here is therefore, that whether there is or there is not any influence on climate from human emissions over and above the natural climate cycles such as the 'Milankovitch' Cycles, Solar Cycles and multi decadal ocean cycles, is presented in the draft legislation with the other side of the scientific debate omitted from being represented. To also present this other scientific view would be necessary to ensure balance and to avoid bias as is required for example by the Nolan Principles of public life.

Examples include:

1. (2) "*The objectives are to ensure that the United Kingdom— (a) reduces its overall contribution to global greenhouse gas emissions..*"

It should be noted that many scientists assert that the acknowledged greenhouse effect, for example, of Carbon Dioxide (CO₂) tails off rapidly around current concentrations, being referred to as 'Saturated' hence having little additional warming effect by more CO₂ being added and why vastly higher past atmospheric CO₂ levels - when plant life evolved - do not correlate with past warming. That means that whilst at very much lower concentrations than today adding CO₂ would be a strong greenhouse gas, at current levels it has become a negligible greenhouse gas. Such crucial differentiation is omitted from this proposed legislation hence allowing the potential for pre-determination of MPs' decisions.

1. (2) (a) (i) “limiting the global mean temperature increase to 1.5 degrees Celsius compared to pre-industrial levels as defined by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change;”

To avoid bias and predetermination it would be helpful to MPs to know that the ‘pre-industrial levels as defined by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change’ (IPCC) were at the end of the ‘Little Ice Age’ natural cooling cycle so may be seen as a potentially pre-determining baseline. The warmest period in the current interglacial is generally acknowledged as being what is called ‘The Holocene Thermal Maximum’ before industrialisation or agriculture. Previous warm periods when life flourished including all species alive today or their ancestor species, are widely reported to have been up to 16C warmer. MPs should be made aware of this to show that a choice of past comparison can give a different and misleading understanding which is necessary to avoid bias and pre-determination as is required by the Nolan Principles of Public Life.

The subject of the above two points appear in various iterations through the text of the proposed Bill and similar comment therefore applies in each instance.

(ii) The Assembly:

3. Public involvement

(1) “The Secretary of State must, within three months of the passing of this Act, procure, by open tender, an expert independent body to establish a Climate and Nature Assembly (‘the Assembly’) comprising a representative sample of the United Kingdom population.”

and

(3) “The Assembly must consider relevant expert advice and publish its recommendations for measures to be included in the strategy.”

To ensure the lack of bias and predetermination required by the Nolan principles of public life it will be necessary for MPs to be guided to consider how reliable it may be that the above body would be ‘independent’ as the range of scientific opinion described above does not seem to be referenced, outlined or acknowledged in this proposed legislation. Similarly who will be tasked with ensuring that relevant expert advice is provided that avoids bias and pre-determination? Such imbalance and omission in the CAN Bill must be addressed before the Can Bill progresses further through Parliament.

(iii) Bias and pre-determination by omission in the ‘science’ around nature recovery as represented in the Can Bill.

Regarding Nature recovery the ‘science’ presented again lacks crucial elements of balance that bring together the main issues in the bill of CO2 and nature. For example the recent Study: “Global Plant Growth Surging alongside Carbon Dioxide” by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, US Department of Commerce, reports the clear and significant benefits of increasing CO2. This is generally accepted as being because current

atmospheric CO2 levels are significantly below that when plants evolved and are suited to. This current depleted level of atmospheric CO2 is because over millions of years life has removed and locked up atmospheric CO2 in fossil fuels and sedimentary ocean floor rocks such as Limestone. Our emissions from using these releases this locked up ancient CO2 back to the atmosphere from where it originally came making human use part of the carbon cycle. Why is such understanding omitted from the CAN Bill? Such omission can be seen as omission and bias potentially leading to pre-determination hence is not consistent with the Nolan principles of public life and must be addressed before the Can Bill progresses further through Parliament.

(iv) Observations on the significant and potentially devastating effects on United Kingdom's citizens and economy from the direct effects and changes that this proposed legislation seeks to implement

These effects need to be more thoroughly presented than in the present wording of the Bill. Such omission can be seen as omission and bias potentially leading to pre-determination hence is not consistent with the Nolan principles of public life and must be brought to the attention of MPs and addressed before the Can Bill progresses further through Parliament.

Examples include:

2. (5) The strategy must—(c) include financial support and retraining for people whose livelihoods and jobs will be affected by the proposed measures—including those measures that require transitioning out of industries characterised by high emissions and high impacts on ecosystems.

and

3. (d) “ensuring the end of the exploration, extraction, export and import of fossil fuels by the United Kingdom as rapidly as possible;”

Within the timescales proposed it is unrealistic that there are sufficient resources of time, money, infrastructure and trained operatives to deliver non fossil fuel alternatives - hence there is likely to be a significant and negative impact on people's lives that would require commensurate and colossal support and financial resources, none of which are written into the aims of the Bill. Furthermore, the Can Bill acknowledges that many are likely to be 'affected by the proposed measures' but without quantifying how great such affect on their lives is likely to be but must be anticipated as significant. It should be noted that the CAN Bill seeks to achieve these major impacts on the lives of UK Citizens and the UK economy based only on consideration of one side only of the two sided scientific debate on whether or not human emissions have any additional effect over and above the natural climate Milankovitch and Solar cycles. This may simply be an omission or it could be that this is not seen as an issue of concern to the Bill's authors. Either way, it is a matter that must be addressed in the proposed Can Bill as proposed legislation. This can be seen as omission

and bias potentially leading to pre-determination hence is not consistent with the Nolan principles of public life and must be brought to the attention of MPs and addressed before the Can Bill progresses further through Parliament.

Overall Conclusion:

For the above reasons the current iteration of The CAN Private Members Bill is not considered fit to progress further in Parliament until or unless it has received significant scrutiny and modification and must be withdrawn from parliamentary debate schedules until this has happened.

The aforementioned political pressure group ZeroHour who is instrumental in pushing for the CAN bill to become law has sent a 15 page brief to every sitting MP to lobby for their support and it is of concern that this document brief is making false and incorrect statements which may mislead many of the 650 MPs to sanction what can only be called an Enabling Act that – if implemented – will sanction severe austerity and hardship as well as a collapse of the economy and British way of life for several generations to come.

<https://www.zerohour.uk/downloads/climate-and-nature-bill-briefing.pdf>

The proposed Climate & Nature Private Members' Bill (CAN) – In Breach of Parliamentary Procedure?

To qualify as a Private Members' Bill, parliamentary rules stipulate that:

1. *'Your bill must keep to the scope that you have set out in the short and long title.'*
2. *'The main aim of your bill must not be to create a new tax or increase Government spending, although if this happens as a secondary effect, it might be allowed. If your bill has any clauses in it that might have financial implications, those clauses may need to be authorised by a resolution of the House before committee stage.'*

<https://guidetoprocedure.parliament.uk/collections/F8ne28KA/rules-on-private-members-bills>

A closer look reveals that both procedural rules may be violated by the CAN Bill. For example, Page 2/3, point (5) (c) under the section: *2. the Duty of the Secretary of State: climate and nature strategy*, seems to be in violation of Rule 1:

'The strategy must—(c) include financial support and retraining for people whose livelihoods and jobs will be affected by the proposed measures—including those measures that require transitioning out of industries characterised by high emissions and high impacts on ecosystems.

Comment: Nowhere in the short or full titles is it mentioned that an intrinsic effect of this proposed new legislation is that, presumably very many people's livelihoods and jobs will be catastrophically 'affected' by the proposed measures at a scale that will require - as part of delivering 'The Strategy' - clearly vast additional financial support and retraining. This would seem a material consideration that MPs reading the full title would be required to be informed of before considering how they may or may not vote.

The proposed CAN Private Members Bill does not mention in any way the above key output and requirement of the in the CAN Bill proposed legislation and thereby does not seem to conform to the 'Rules on Private Members' Bills'. Its progress through parliament should thus be suspended until this matter has been formally and fully considered.

Examples of violations of Rule 2 appear in the following sections of the Bill where it specifies measures with considerable foreseeable essential costs:

2. (2) *"The strategy must include annual interim targets consistent with the achievement of the objectives and the Secretary of State must take all reasonable steps to meet those annual interim targets."*

Comment: Meeting interim targets requires raising considerable and colossal new funding for substantial foreseeable Government expenditure, for example on significant new non fossil fuel energy infrastructure and other measures.

2. (3) *"The strategy must include measures that, subject to sections 3 and 4, will achieve the objectives specified in section."*

Comment: Meeting interim targets requires considerable foreseeable Government expenditure, for example, on significant new non fossil fuel energy infrastructure.

2. (3) (d) *ensuring the end of the exploration, extraction, export and import of fossil fuels by the United Kingdom as rapidly as possible;*

Comment: Meeting this targets to transition away from fossil fuels requires considerable foreseeable Government expenditure for example on significant new non fossil fuel energy infrastructure.

2. (5) The strategy must —(c) include financial support and retraining for people whose livelihoods and jobs will be affected by the proposed measures—including those measures that require transitioning out of industries characterised by high emissions and high impacts on ecosystems.

Comment: Meeting this target requires considerable foreseeable Government expenditure for example on income support and/or other benefits and for arranging and retraining for considerable numbers of people.

3. Public Involvement

(1) *The Secretary of State must, within three months of the passing of this Act, procure, by open tender, an expert independent body to establish a Climate and Nature Assembly ('the Assembly') comprising a representative sample of the United Kingdom population.*

Comment: Meeting this target requires considerable foreseeable and stated Government expenditure on procurement.

7. Financial provisions

There is to be paid out of money provided by Parliament—

(a) any expenditure incurred under or by virtue of this Act; and

(b) any increase attributable to this Act in the sums payable under any other Act out of money so provided.

Comment: Clause 7 above specifically commits considerable public expenditure including, but not limited to, the total of all the items listed above it.

Conclusion: Regarding the Rule on Private Members' Bills that: *"The main aim of your bill must not be to create a new tax or increase Government spending, although if this happens as a secondary effect, it might be allowed. If your bill has any clauses in it that might have financial implications, those clauses may need to be authorised by a resolution of the House before committee stage."* it is concluded that the proposed CAN Private Members Bill does intrinsically require considerable foreseen increases in Government spending as an intrinsic primary effect and in places this is specifically stated among its aims. Thereby, it does not seem to conform to the 'Rules on Private Members' Bills'. Its progress through parliament should thus be suspended until this matter has been formally and fully considered.

For the above reasons it is considered that seeking to progress this proposed CAN Bill legislation in its current form through the Private Members Bill process in the manner followed to date can be seen as a possible abuse of this process and should immediately be suspended pending further detailed and fully independent scrutiny and legal advice.

PART IV

The Climate & Nature Bill – The Climate Doomsday XR Cult rejected by the Public in 2019 on course to be made law in 2025

The above clearly demonstrates that many charities such as the National Trust and the RSPB have been infiltrated and hi-jacked by fringe eco-extremist, eschatological ideology such as that of XR and its affiliated offshoots Just Stop Oil and Insulate Britain, right through to chief executive level. This uses strategies such as, for example, the pseudo democratic process of RAPID Democracy and Citizens' Assemblies (see eg. Peoples' Plan For Nature above) or the voting on political resolutions by only a minute, non representative number of members (see eg. National Trust AGM, November 2024 above) which is then passed off falsely to represent the views of their often extremely large and unsuspecting membership bases.

Establishing Citizens' Assemblies is one of the main demands of XR in their ideology of 'Beyond Politics', which is a direct attack on the democratic parliamentary process which it seeks to bypass and subvert via such Assemblies.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Extinction_Rebellion

All this is an attempt to give a veneer of legitimacy and proclaimed mandate for the charities' political campaigning and activism to push for – amongst others – the legal requirement to achieve net zero, the complete cessation of the use of fossil fuels, a declaration of a climate emergency by the government and the taking out of substantial amounts of land currently used for food production for re-wilding by 2030, ie. in the next five years – all culminating and set out in the aforementioned Climate & Nature Bill (CAN) to be enshrined as legally binding in 2025.

Cultist Ideology spread across all areas of British life through the hi-jacking of non political institutions and charities

With many countries in the world now seemingly waking from the slumber of being misled into and following the eco hysteria and doomsday cult for the past decade - if the lack of statesmen's attendance of the currently ongoing Cop29 in Baku is anything to go by - the United Kingdom appears to be going in the opposite direction vying for first place in this race to the bottom of who will obliterate their country's entire infrastructure, de-industrialise and plunge the population into extreme poverty fasted – all achieved through extreme authoritarianism and the abolishment of long standing civil rights and liberties – in other words a kind of cult like mass economic and cultural self harm and suicide.

<https://www.msn.com/en-gb/money/other/keir-starmer-unveils-yet-another-eco-target-at-cop29-climate-summit/ar-AA1tYsxd>

The UK's continued commitment to the race to the bottom through pushing for eco-fascism

The question must arise for why this is so, what makes the UK commit to and pursue this demonstratively and predictably detrimental Eco-fascist policy that amounts to self-harm and could be seen as mentally unstable perhaps, when the rest of the world is turning back to resuming capitalism with renewed vigour and is indeed striving for increased industrialisation?

In the hunt for clues to answer this question it needs to be considered whether what we are looking at is indeed a cult and if so, what kind of a cult we are dealing with.

Cult allegations levelled against Extinction Rebellion

Cult allegation have been raised frequently since the emergence of XR in 2018 and this is what Wikipedia says:

'Extinction Rebellion has been accused of being a cult by the media, environmental activists as well as several former senior XR members. Sherrie Yeomans, coordinator of XR blockades in the English city of Bristol accused the group of being a manipulative cult and former XR spokeswoman [Zion Lights](#) accused [Roger Hallam](#) of creating a cult by fear-mongering such as when he forced her to claim that 6 billion would die by the end of the century due to climate change and further claimed that he compared himself to a prophet. ^[132] Hallam had compared climate change to the Holocaust and claimed that the climate crisis would lead to mass rape and has called for the overthrow of governments even if it results in deaths resulting in him being accused of fostering a death cult.^[133]^[132]

German former [Green Party](#) politician [Jutta Ditfurth](#) accused it of being a [doomsday cult](#) with members blindly following esoteric gurus.[\[134\]](#) ‘

The British author and journalist Douglas Murray further stated in 2019 in his article ‘*Extinction Rebellion fanatics have empty lives*’:

‘London has seen cults and sects come and go since Roman days at least. But there is something about XR that is fascinating precisely because those involved both seem to be putting themselves in that lineage and yet would resist the comparison. This time — they insist — it really is the end of the world. All the earlier fanatics were just faking it. In societies such as modern Britain we have means and comforts that our forebears could never have dreamed of. But having achieved them, we don’t know what to do with them, and some people are bored. Bored with their jobs, bored with the lack of struggle, bored with the lack of heroism and purpose that security brings.

So, unsure what to build next, or how else to gain purpose, a certain number of people are finding meaning in self-denial and self-blame. They’re finding ultimate meaning in the call to repent before the imminent, partly longed for, apocalypse. XR has risen — and will fade — like similar fanatical movements before it. But aside from some happy memories for the participants, the thought it most clearly leaves behind for me is the question of why, when people in modern democracies reach out, yearning for meaning, XR answers their call.’

<https://unherd.com/2019/10/extinction-rebellion-fanatics-have-empty-lives/>

This Spiked Online article at the time described XR’s protests and ordinary peoples’ reaction as follows:

‘On the Tube train I was on the driver announced a delay ‘due to protests’. Cue an enormous groan from the teeming train-riders. In Canning Town an angry crowd of working people even [dragged XR protesters off the top of a Tube train](#). The sight of one of the protesters kicking at the commuters to prevent them from reaching him really showed how nasty and contemptuous of the public these green extremists have become. This is the reactionary middle classes insulting and assaulting ordinary people – horrible.

Some leftists and greens have been shocked by today’s rebellion against Extinction Rebellion. They’re saying XR should change tactics. But the problem here isn’t tactics – no, this ugly, elitist inconveniencing of ordinary people represents the actual content of XR’s outlook. It captures the fundamentals of this movement, which is a backward-looking, anti-progress, anti-people outfit. Today’s XR sneering at working people wasn’t a mistaken tactic – it was the essence of [environmentalism](#).

The idea that XR must now change tack to try to win over more working people is ridiculous. People reject this elitist movement. They reject its alarmism, its snobbery, its anti-humanism, and its demands for crippling austerity. We saw that today. Commuters’ message was ‘Fuck Extinction Rebellion’. And that’s a positive, progressive, forward-looking political demand we can organise around.’

<https://www.spiked-online.com/2019/10/17/finally-a-rebellion-against-extinction-rebellion/>

How did a – by the British public – recognised doomsday death cult become mainstream, dictating policy and law?

So, how did a 'doomsday' cult, an 'anti-human death cult' that was clearly recognised as such by the majority of the British public as well as many who initially joined as members when XR first became active in 2018/19, make it to becoming mainstream so that this cult religion is now just a step away from becoming law through the proposed Climate & Nature Bill (CAN)?

Earlier on in this article, the prominent proactive involvement of icons such as Sir David Attenborough and Chris Packam in pushing for the eco-agenda has been outlined. Both are patrons of the organisation Population Matters which is discussed below.

Sir David Attenborough – A British Icon who describes humans as a 'Plague on the Earth'

A closer look at David Attenborough reveals that he came to the anthropogenic argument for climate change in 2004, speaking out about this issue for the first time in 2006, since when he has taken a central role in pushing for the fanatical aims of net zero and elevating nature above basic human rights such as the right to life and family life. Wikipedia states:

'Attenborough has linked anthropogenic effects on the environment with [human population growth](#).^{[135][136][137]} He has attracted criticism for his views on [human overpopulation](#)^[138] and [human population control](#).^[139] He is a patron of [Population Matters](#),^[140] a UK charity advocating for [family planning](#), sustainable consumption and proposed [sustainable human population](#).^{[141][142]} In a 2013 interview with the [Radio Times](#), Attenborough described humans as a "plague on the Earth",^{[143][144]} and described the act of [sending food](#) to [famine](#)-stricken countries as "barmy" for population reasons.^{[139][145]} He called for more debate about human population growth,^[139] saying that since he "first started making programmes 60 years ago, the human population has tripled."^[146] Attenborough advocates for people to adopt a vegetarian diet or to reduce meat consumption to save [wildlife](#), noting that "the planet can't support billions of meat-eaters."^[134]
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/David_Attenborough

Chris Packam – Another British icon who advocates for a reduction in human population

A look at Chris Packam, Vice president of the RSPB and the Wildlife Trusts, reveals a similarly concerning view:

'Packham is a patron of [Population Matters](#) (formerly the Optimum Population Trust). In an interview with [The Daily Telegraph](#) in 2010,^[80] Packham said that "[The human population is sowing the seeds of a mass extinction event](#)" and advocated for humans reducing their population. In 2017, he again expressed this view^[81] saying that if every woman could be emancipated, birth rates would drop.^[82]

Packham took part in [Veganuary](#) in 2019 and subsequently decided to remain a [vegan](#), following three decades of [vegetarianism](#).^[91] Later that year, Packham stated he would [no-longer take internal flights](#) and that he had purchased an [electric car](#).^[92] ‘

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Chris_Packham

Of course, it is not the first time that such anti-human sentiment has been voiced either by trusted icons or those in positions of extreme power and influence, especially when these figures have been committed environmentalists. Notably, the late Prince Phillip said in 1988:

‘In the event that I am reincarnated, I would like to return as a deadly virus, to contribute something to solving overpopulation.’ <https://www.businessinsider.com/prince-philip-quote-reincarnating-deadly-virus-resurfaces-twitter-2021-4?op=1>

The Organisation Population Matters – ‘Environmental Problems are easier to solve with fewer people’

‘Population Matters, formerly known as the Optimum Population Trust, is a UK-based charity^[1] that addresses population size and its effects on [environmental sustainability](#). It considers population growth as a major contributor to [environmental degradation](#), [biodiversity loss](#), [resource depletion](#) and [climate change](#).^{[2][3][4]} The group promotes ethical, choice-based solutions through lobbying, campaigning and awareness-raising. Population Matters’ mission is to drive positive, large-scale action through fostering choices that help achieve a sustainable human population and regenerate our environment. Population Matters promotes five solutions to slow and ultimately reverse population growth:^[10]

- Achieve global gender equality
- Remove all barriers to modern family planning
- Quality education for all
- Global justice and sustainable economies
- Promote small family size

In addition, recognising the disproportionately large environmental footprint of wealthy nations, the charity calls for reducing consumption in high-income countries.^[11] ‘

As one of the patrons of Population Matters, David Attenborough’s forward reads:

‘All our environmental problems become easier to solve with fewer people, and harder – and ultimately impossible – to solve with ever more people.’

<https://populationmatters.org/>

The proposed Population Reduction – Who is earmarked to exit the Planet first?

Whilst there is naturally nothing wrong with exploring all aspects when examining any perceived challenges that are concerning the future of the planet per se in a hypothetical and philosophical way, the question must arise as to who those who voice these demands for the world population to be reduced – preferably as fast as possible – would suggest exits the planet first?

It is of concern that those who are instrumental in calling for the CAN bill to be made law with the resulting and inevitable catastrophic consequences for the UK economy, the destruction of an entire way of life, loss of identity and culture as well as all civil liberties and fundamental human rights within the next five years, have been radicalised in the past decade or so. Their initially potentially genuine interest, care and concern for the environment through such radicalisation and cultism has thus been taken to its only logical extremist conclusion calling for either rapid population reduction, or for policies to be implemented at such speed (within five years) that this will inevitably cause fast population decline through causing extreme poverty, lack of reliable access to energy, food insecurity and a collapse of the infrastructure and the economy.

The proposed brave new world to solve the perceived environmental problems facing the planet which is meeting net zero, where we only live in smart 15 minutes cities, own nothing, rent everything, are fed synthetic food, use no cars and where going into the protected and guarded countryside will be a privilege occasionally granted to the select few only, is indeed easier to achieve when there are fewer people as Sir David Attenborough advocates and who sees humans as ‘the plague on the earth’.

The proposed Assistant Dying Bill which is currently going through parliament should thus be vigorously opposed given the prevailing death cult mindset also underpinning other proposed legislation such as the CAN Bill. As the current UK government has shown itself to be unworthy of the British people’s trust, such legislation handing power to them over when, why and how people die would leave the public exposed to potential misuse of power, by ordering or coercing people to agree to an early and unwanted death.

Is Britain already on track for self destruction even without the CAN Bill becoming law?

Even before the Climate & Nature Bill is potentially enshrined into law in 2025, Britain is already on track for a possible holodomor with taking agricultural land out of production for rapid re-wilding of a minimum of 30% by 2030 and anti-farming policies which makes a land grab possible for eg building vast solar farms, building eco towns or just greedy portfolio building.

From a purely logistical and practical viewpoint, none of the policies that would become a legally binding requirement for the government to put into practice through the CAN bill

scale up and are achievable within five years if the UK population is not reduced down from the current 70 million drastically and quickly.

With those who drive the push for the original XR extremist environmental politics to become law six years after the British public had already recognised and rejected this for what it is, ie. an anti-human death cult, having infiltrated seemingly all British institutions, charitable organisations, NGOs, broadcasting, media, school curriculum, faith groups, as well as local government and parliament, the future for Britain looks bleak indeed.

Time for the British public to withdraw their falsely implied and claimed consent to their planned eco enslavement by terminating their memberships of respective charities en masse & make their sense of betrayal known audibly

This paper represents an attempt to shed light onto the mechanisms by which British democracy and its institutions have been systematically undermined and dismantled by way of hi-jacking the public's trust and good will in supporting eg. charities that they believe to be apolitical and that they have joined in their millions unawares that this membership is misused and exploited to establish eco-fascism XR and Just Stop Oil style. All the while the British public has been under psychological attack and subjected through eg. Neurolinguistic Programming (NLP) through eg. decades of BBC nature programmes which have become increasingly climate and nature alarmist, doomsday cultist and apocalyptic.

It may be time for the British public to rethink their membership of any charity or organisation they belong to such as the National Trust, RSPB, WWF or even the Women's Institute and to recognise that their membership and the fees that they hand over in good faith are misused in orchestrating the destruction of all that makes Britain what it is, its heritage, culture, values and civil liberties – ultimately not to protect nature and the climate as is claimed but for the enrichment and greed of the few.

It is perhaps not a great surprise that the UK seems to be one of the last countries, or perhaps eventually the last country, to double down and commit ever more to the destruction of everything that makes Britain Britain, bearing in mind that the main supporter and driving force for the global 'green' policies is their own king.
